

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, March 13, 1989

The House met at 12 noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

For all Your good gifts, O God, we offer our praise; for Your providence to us through all the years, we offer our word of gratitude. As we look to the days ahead, may not Your loving concern for us lessen, or Your acts of forgiveness and mercy for us ever diminish, but may Your mighty hand of grace ever give us the strength and the peace that You alone can give. In Your name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Would the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] kindly lead the Members in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MONTGOMERY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 553. An act to provide for more balance in the stocks of dairy products purchased by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

A TRIBUTE TO THE FIGHTING IRISH AND THEIR SUPPORTERS

(Mr. HILER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HILER. Mr. Speaker, as college football fans everywhere know, January 2, 1989, was a great day for the Irish. On that day, the Fighting Irish of the University of Notre Dame won the Fiesta Bowl and secured the national championship to the delight of their thousands of fans. Although I am certainly one of them, I enjoy a privilege my fellow Notre Dame fans do not. I have the honor to represent

the University of Notre Dame in this body.

I wish to take this opportunity to commend Lou Holtz, his staff, and the superb athletes they coach on a tremendous victory over a very tough University of West Virginia team. The victory over the Mountaineers capped an outstanding 12-0 season for the team. The university, the community, the Nation can be proud of them.

Their achievement shows the dedication and determination that inspire millions. I am not an alumnus of the college, so I don't think I can be accused of the sin of bragging, when I say that I believe Notre Dame, and its football team, are loved in a special way. Over the years, the Fighting Irish have won their share of national championships, produced many Heisman Trophy winners and boast some of the legendary names of college football—Knut Rockne, George Gipp, the Four Horsemen, Frank Leahy, and scores of others. But that success has not come at the expense of educational excellence. Notre Dame wins the old fashioned way. The players and the coaches play by the rules. Players at Notre Dame are students first. They either make the grades, or don't play. They go to class, they earn their diplomas and they graduate. In this day of widespread scandal and cheating in college athletic programs, Notre Dame is to be commended for adhering to academic principles and for refusing to conform to the notion of "win at any cost."

So, Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the students, faculty, administration, and friends of the University of Notre Dame on the great accomplishment of their outstanding football team. I am honored to represent this fine institution, and I have every confidence that Coach Holtz and the Fighting Irish will keep me coming back to this floor to commend them for many victories in the future.

LEGISLATION TO REQUIRE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A PRESIDENTIAL EMERGENCY BOARD IN THE EASTERN AIRLINES STRIKE

(Mr. STANGELAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STANGELAND. Mr. Speaker, later this week, the House will consider legislation that would require the President to appoint a Presidential

Emergency Board [PEB] in the Eastern Air Lines strike.

In my view, the establishment of such a board in this case is not justified on either legal or policy grounds. The Railway Labor Act requires such a board only when there is a national transportation emergency. Although some people are certainly inconvenienced, a strike at one airline does not create a national emergency.

In addition, the Emergency Board has no power to end the dispute. It can only make recommendations which will certainly be ignored by one or both parties.

In the end, the only way to resolve this dispute is for both parties to sit down and negotiate it out. That will occur only when we no longer hold out this false hope of Government intervention through an Emergency Board.

I am also including in the RECORD additional points that Members are welcome to use when we consider this bill later this week, including two editorials.

Mr. Speaker, on March 9, the Committee on Public Works and Transportation reported H.R. 1231 to establish a Presidential Emergency Board to investigate the labor dispute at Eastern Air Lines.

Arguments in opposition to this legislation follow as well as two pertinent editorials.

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION TO H.R. 1231

I. There is no basis for convening an emergency board under the Railway Labor Act.

Under the Railway Labor Act, an emergency board may be convened by the President if the airline labor dispute "threaten(s) substantially to interrupt interstate commerce to a degree such as to deprive any section of the country of essential transportation services."

No such interruption or threat has occurred since the strike against Eastern began 10 days ago. Other air carriers and other modes of transportation have been able to provide transportation in the absence of Eastern.

There is no logic whatever in applying the Railway Labor Act to a competitive industry that could handle a strike without creating a major dislocation. Since deregulation, other airlines are readily available to provide the service. Other transportation modes can help also.

For this reason, no emergency board has been convened in any of the five major airline strikes since the industry was deregulated in 1978, even though they involved carriers, such as United, which are larger than Eastern.

II. If a substantial interruption to commerce is achieved as a result of secondary picketing, the appropriate response would be for the Congress to ban secondary picketing in the airline and railroad industries.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

The only factor that threatens a national transportation emergency in this case is the ability of labor to conduct secondary picketing.

Instead of creating an emergency board, Congress should ban secondary picketing. This would solve the problem of disruption to commerce while permitting the parties to this labor dispute to fight it out on their own turf.

It is important to emphasize that the "right" to conduct secondary picketing is unique to the airline and railroad industries, and even there it has been recognized only for the last two years.

Secondary picketing gives labor the power to turn a purely local dispute into a national crisis. In effect, it gives labor the power to hold hostage the users of transportation services across the country—passengers, shippers and consumers—to achieve their goals in a dispute with one employer.

No other industry is allowed to engage in this type of secondary picketing.

III. The creation of a Presidential Emergency Board will do nothing to achieve resolution of the labor dispute between Eastern and the machinists. We will simply find ourselves in the same position 26 days from now as we are today.

The parties have been in mediation for over a year without coming close to an agreement. There is little likelihood that the parties will agree to the recommendations of a board.

If the Congress is willing to prolong the process now by establishing an emergency board, the Congress will likely legislate further cooling off periods when the 26 days end. In the 3 most recent rail disputes where emergency boards were established, additional cooling off periods of 2 to 3 months beyond the initial 26 day period were mandated by Congress.

Since the parties are not likely to come to agreement, we are left with either a series of additional cooling off periods (which will surely kill Eastern) or a legislative solution to the entire dispute. Legislative "cram-downs" are definitely not a desirable way to settle private labor disputes in the airline industry.

The only way to resolve this dispute is to allow the battle to go on as it does in any other industry: let the parties use self-help and let the chips fall where they may.

IV. The only way for Eastern Airlines to survive is through a quick resolution of the current labor dispute. The survival of Eastern as a viable carrier is important to maintaining competition in the airline industry.

Eastern has lost almost \$500 million since the mediation process began and was losing more than \$1 million each day before the strike began.

If the parties are required to go back to the status quo as it existed before the strike began, Eastern will lose money at a much greater rate because it will take time to restore its service to previous levels.

Establishment of a Presidential Emergency Board will not lead to a resolution of the dispute. It will only prolong the dispute.

The only possibility for a quick resolution of the dispute is to allow the strike to proceed. Eastern may not be able to survive a strike, but at least there will be some resolution of the issue. Whether or not Eastern survives should be a function of the actions taken by labor and management. It should not be the function of government imposed solutions.

With increasing concentration in the airline industry, it is important for Eastern to

remain a viable air carrier. The demise of Eastern will result in further concentration in the industry and a corresponding decline in competition.

V. The Railway Labor Act is outmoded and is no longer an efficient or fair way to resolve labor disputes in the airline industry.

The Railway Labor Act was enacted in 1926, at a time when the railroads were heavily regulated and essentially the only means of transportation. The Act was extended to the airlines in the 1930's when the industry was young and heavily regulated.

The Act was designed to prevent strikes, because any strike against a railroad would be likely to cripple the national transportation system. It did so by creating an open-ended mediation process, during which the status quo would be preserved. Existing contracts under the Act do not terminate until a new contract is in place.

Indeed, the preservation of the status quo under the Railway Labor Act always favors one party over the other. In inflationary times management has an incentive to keep negotiations open so as to avoid paying higher wages. In deflationary times, or when an industry is particularly competitive, labor has an incentive to keep negotiations open to avoid wage cuts.

In this case Eastern has been locked in negotiations for 17 months under the preexisting contract terms. During this time it has lost almost half a billion dollars.

In summary, the rationale for the Railway Labor Act is no longer relevant to a deregulated airline industry. A competitive transportation industry no longer needs special provisions to avoid strikes at all costs. Labor disputes in the airline industry should be treated the same as in any other industry.

VI. As a general rule, the Federal government should stay out of labor disputes.

An emergency board has authority only to recommend, not to impose a resolution of the dispute. Because of the animosity and distance between the parties, any such recommendation would undoubtedly be rejected, by one or both of the parties. Enormous pressure would then be focused on Congress and the President for enactment of legislation imposing a contract on the parties.

Settling labor disputes by Federal statutes is bad public policy, especially when the dispute arises in an industry which is as highly competitive as the aviation industry.

Moreover, in the case of the dispute between Eastern and its unions, it would be unprecedented for the government to intervene in a situation where the company involved is losing the enormous sums of money that Eastern is losing and is in the dire economic predicament that Eastern is in.

And finally, intervening in the Eastern dispute will encourage other transportation unions to settle their disputes in the political arena.

VII. The bill is flawed because the emergency board's proceedings cover two unions, the Airline Pilots Association and the Transportation Workers Union, who have not gone through the collective bargaining requirements of the Railway Labor Act.

Unlike the International Association of Machinists, these two unions have not reached a state of impasse with Eastern.

While there might be some cases where an emergency board is justified when the parties have exhausted all procedures under the Railway Labor Act, it is never justified where parties are in a preliminary stage. This short circuits the process and sets a

bad precedent for unions and management to come to Congress to resolve their differences.

It is particularly ludicrous to expect an emergency board to arrive at comprehensive recommendations for labor agreements with these two unions in 19 days, when their negotiations are still preliminary.

VIII. The shortening of the time periods in the bill does not solve the defects in the bill. If anything it will make it more difficult for the emergency board to reach meaningful recommendations.

The committee amendment shortens the time for the emergency board to report to the President from 30 days to 14 days, with a possible extension of 5 days. After the board reports, the cooling off period is 7 days (reduced from 30 days).

No matter when this period ends, there is virtually no chance that this process will result in the parties coming any closer together.

The shortening of the time period is illusory and creates the false hope that the board will actually be able to produce results in that period. In fact, the average length of emergency boards in airline labor disputes is 77 days. We can't expect that, in a dispute as complicated as this one, a board will come to resolution in this short a period.

IX. Eastern's filing for bankruptcy under chapter 11 makes H.R. 1231 ill advised and possibly unconstitutional.

If the effect of H.R. 1231 would be to override the power of the bankruptcy judge to carry out his authority to change the terms and conditions of employment, it might well violate Article 1, section 8, clause 4 of the Constitution, which requires uniform bankruptcy laws.

Any further attempt by Congress to legislate the recommendations of a presidential emergency board would have even greater constitutional problems. This is very similar to the law that provided up to \$75 million in unemployment benefits in the Rock Island Railroad reorganization, which was held unconstitutional by the Supreme Court.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 7, 1989]

EASTERN ON STRIKE

Fortunately for travelers and commuters, the machinists striking Eastern Airlines have not so far tried to extend the disruption with secondary boycotts. Perhaps it is fortunate for the machinists' union as well. Frank Lorenzo, who controls Eastern, has generated a degree of public sympathy for the airline's employees through his harsh and heavy-handed tactics in dealing with them. That sympathy would quickly vanish if the union set out deliberately to strand as many people as possible by picketing railroads and other airlines with no part in this quarrel and no responsibility for it. For the people holding Eastern tickets, the inconvenience has already been more than sufficient.

Some of the union's officials continue to talk of fighting the court orders against secondary picketing and then proceeding to carry their strike to other carriers. The strategy would be to create such chaos that the mounting economic damage would force President Bush to appoint the emergency board that they seek. It would begin a process that ends with congressional legislation writing, in effect, a union contract into law and imposing it on the employer. It's an obsolete procedure that has no place in a deregulated airline industry.

Mr. Bush refused on Friday to take that road. The administration has added that, if the union attempts secondary boycotts, it will immediately seek legislation to prohibit them. But both the White House and the machinists must realize that this strike is not going to be ended by legislation—neither the kind that the union wants nor the kind that the administration threatens. In Congress, each side is quite capable of blocking the other. The case for abolishing secondary boycotts is strong, and in all industries but transportation they were prohibited a generation ago. But the composition of the labor committees makes it highly unlikely that any bill will move as long as the strike continues.

As for the strike itself, it's off to a bad start for Eastern. Management clearly underestimated the pilots' and flight attendants' resentment of their treatment at the hands of Mr. Lorenzo. The airline had hoped to fly through the strike with nearly normal operations, using newly hired non-union mechanics and baggage handlers to replace the strikers. That clearly isn't going to work. Eastern has now had to cancel all but a very few flights.

It's an airline with a long and respected history, but this strike may destroy it. Mr. Lorenzo has been looking for trouble ever since he took control of Eastern. Now he has found it, and perhaps more than he bargained for. It's hard to be very sorry.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 28, 1989]

MR. KIRKLAND'S WORDS, MR. BUSH'S TEST

Lane Kirkland, president of the A.F.L.-C.I.O., protests that an editorial on Friday wrongly characterized his position on the labor dispute at Eastern Air Lines. The editorial, drawing from published news reports, said he had warned, if there should be a strike against Eastern, of widespread disruption in the transportation industry, including moves against railroads. Mr. Kirkland says he said no such thing [see Letters], and we accept that with apology for the error.

Others in organized labor do talk of secondary job actions. For instance, the heads of the railroad unions recently declared, ominously, that labor action against Eastern "has the potential to spread to other air carriers, as well as the rail commuter and freight industry." How the President responds to such threats will likely have a lasting effect on labor relations nationwide.

The National Mediation Board, a feeble agency charged with keeping labor peace in the rail and airline industries, has recommended that the President use his authority to prevent a strike for 60 days. Such intervention would set a dangerous precedent, effectively ending the neutrality of the Federal government in the dispute and short-circuiting collective bargaining.

The dispute involves Eastern's baggage handlers and mechanics. Their labor contract expired 13 months ago; only last month did the Mediation Board finally get around to declaring a bargaining impasse, opening the way for a work stoppage on Saturday. Eastern has vowed to fly through a strike and labor is worried that Eastern could succeed.

That explains the threats to disrupt service at other airlines and on railroads, something that the Supreme Court seems to sanction. These threats give the President the legal rationale and the political incentive to put off a strike for 60 days while a board proposes settlement terms.

No board would be likely to find the mutually acceptable settlement that has eluded

bargainers for so long. But Eastern, hobbled by work slowdowns, is losing so much money that it would probably run out of cash before the 60 days ended. And that would probably force Eastern's management to sell the carrier in pieces—to airlines more willing to pay industry-scale wages.

Why would that be so terrible? Because Eastern's demise would eliminate the carrier with the greatest incentive to lower fares to gain market share and to keep the industry competitive. More important, if Eastern were thus defeated, Washington would leave itself open to future obstructionism. Why should the transport unions bargain in good faith if the White House can be bullied into stopping strikes at the expense of any troubled carrier?

If the Federal Government does anything to intervene, it should be for the long term, in the interpretation of labor law. The Supreme Court holds that transport unions are uniquely free to entangle the Government in their labor disputes by disrupting service with secondary strikes. The permanent answer to bullying and threats is for Congress to make such boycotts illegal.

For the moment, however, Mr. Bush's wisest immediate course is clear: to stay out of the way.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE DALE E. KILDEE, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable DALE E. KILDEE:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 7, 1989.

HON. JIM WRIGHT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
H204 Capitol.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you, pursuant to Rule L(50) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that an employee in my office has been served with a subpoena duces tecum issued by the State of Michigan, 68th Judicial District.

After consultation with the General Counsel to the Clerk, and with agreement of the constituents involved, I will comply with the subpoena.

Sincerely,

DALE E. KILDEE,
Member of Congress.

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO FILE CERTAIN REPORTS ON H.R. 1231, EASTERN AIR LINES STRIKE LEGISLATION

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works and Transportation may have until 5 p.m. today, Monday, March 13, 1989, to file certain reports on H.R. 1231.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Republican leadership, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

WORKING POOR WOULD BENEFIT BY EARNED INCOME TAX CREDIT REFORM

(Mr. PETRI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, we have the lowest level of unemployment in 15 years—but Congress can still change all that.

All we have to do is raise the minimum wage.

A \$4.65 minimum wage would destroy hundreds of thousands of jobs for low-skilled workers. That's what the so-called friends of the working poor have planned.

And, Mr. Speaker, nobody seems to be talking about the effect a higher minimum wage would have on the Federal budget.

Last year, Beryl Sprinkel, of the Council of Economic Advisers estimated that increasing the minimum wage to \$4.65 would increase the budget deficit by \$2 to \$6 billion per year.

Two to six billion dollars per year.

Where is the money going to come from?

It's all so pointless when there is a better way to help the working poor.

Reform the earned income tax credit!

Target the aid directly to poor workers who are supporting families.

If accomplished in accordance with my Family Living Wage Act, reform of the earned income tax credit would provide more aid to those who need it, and do it at less cost—both in terms of jobs and money—than would raising the minimum wage.

It is time for new thinking instead of yesterday's failed so-called solutions.

Reform the earned income tax credit.

THE POTENTIAL PITFALLS OF LEGISLATION CREATING EASTERN AIRLINES EMERGENCY BOARD

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to inform my colleagues that the full Committee on Public Works and Transportation reported H.R. 1231 to the House on March 9, 1989. This legislation directs the President to establish an emergency board under section 10 of the Railway Labor Act to investigate and make recommendations concerning the labor dispute at Eastern Air Lines. A majority of committee Republicans believe that the labor dispute at Eastern must come to an end at the earliest possible opportunity. It is our position that the creation of a Presidential emergency board will only delay efforts to resolve the dispute and may, in fact, jeopardize the continued existence of a very fine airline.

It is expected that this legislation will be taken up on the House floor as early as Wednesday of this week. I urge my colleagues to pay close attention to this legislation which may cause the liquidation of Eastern Air Lines.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I direct their attention to the minority views contained in the extension of remarks, which I am inserting today, outlining the potential pitfalls of this ill-conceived legislation.

A TRIBUTE TO FRANCIS MARION, SOUTH CAROLINA'S "SWAMP FOX"

THE SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. TALLON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

MR. TALLON. Mr. Speaker, throughout the long history of the State of South Carolina, there have been a number of individuals who have helped to shape our State through great achievement and personal sacrifice. One such man is Francis Marion, who, despite his great victories and political accomplishments has never been sufficiently recognized.

Francis Marion was born on the coastal plains of colonial South Carolina in the 1730's—the date of his birth is only indicated by the fact that it is known that he died in his 63d year.

He spent his youth near the port town of Georgetown, helping out his family, until he decided to go to sea at the age of 15. This did not go well for him.

Francis Marion was in a shipwreck on a return trip to South Carolina from the West Indies. He traveled for many days in a small open boat with six other men and a dog.

Only five of them survived the ordeal, and when he was rescued, Francis Marion decided to pursue his life on land, returning to his family and farming.

Francis Marion's military career began at the age of 25 when he enlisted to do battle with Cherokee Indians who were threatening a community of colonial South Carolinians. He led a small group of men against the Cherokee at the Battle of Etchoee, but shortly after the battle the Indians burned the ripening fields and the entire village of Etchoee. It was said to have brought tears to Marion's eyes.

In 1775 Marion served as a member of the South Carolina Provincial Congress, and subsequently became a captain in the army of a volunteer group to fight the British in the Charleston area. In February 1776 he was promoted to major, and then in November to lieutenant colonel.

In 1780, due to a sprained ankle, Francis Marion was left behind in Charleston to risk imminent capture when Gen. Benjamin Lincoln surrendered his troops to the British forces. But he gathered together a small band of men and descended into the swamps and created a secret hideout on Snow's Island on the Pee Dee River.

From these secluded headquarters Francis Marion continued to fight for the revolutionary cause. Small bands

of rebel soldiers led by Marion would raid the British camps. The British were surprised time after time by the swiftness with which Marion and his troops would attack and slip away into the swamps. They became intent on capturing Francis Marion.

One British cavalry officer in particular, Banastre Tarleton, took an extreme interest in capturing Marion. In one particular incident Tarleton had been chasing Marion through 26 miles of swamp for 7 hours when he has been quoted as saying, "But as for this damn old fox, the devil himself could not catch him!"

Tarleton never did catch Francis Marion, and through his then legendary feats, Marion became endeared to all South Carolinians as the "Swamp Fox."

In August 1781, Marion and his troops made a successful attempt to rescue Americans who were surrounded by British Troops at Parkers Ferry, SC. As a result of this successful mission, Marion received a thanks from Congress, and soon after was advanced to brigadier general. Also in 1781, Francis Marion was elected as a representative to the South Carolina Legislature. He was reelected in 1782 and 1784.

At the end of the war, Francis Marion settled into a somewhat quieter existence, marrying a cousin named Mary Videau and living at Pond Bluff, SC. He died on February 26, 1795, his accomplishments already sealed within the history of the fledgling United States of America.

In 1783, before Marion died, the Senate of South Carolina passed the following resolutions to recognize and thank Marion:

Resolved, That the thanks of this House be given to Brigadier General Francis Marion, in his place, as a member of this House, for his eminent and conspicuous services to his country."

Resolved, That a gold medal be given to Brigadier General Francis Marion, as a mark of public approbation for his great, glorious, and meritorious conduct.

It is believed that the resolution and a laudatory speech to Francis Marion was as far as the action was taken—the gold medal was never presented to Marion.

Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a joint resolution that the Congress might properly recognize the accomplishments of this great patriot. I would also like to thank my constituent, Russell Black, of Berkeley County, who first brought the resolution passed by the State senate to my attention.

REMEMBERING THE KATYN FOREST MASSACRE

THE SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

MR. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the massacre in Katyn Forest took place a generation ago, in a place now nearly forgotten by much of the world. But to many believers in freedom and justice, the slaughter of thousands of Polish officers 45 years ago remains an unpunished crime.

Last year, in memory of those young officers—the best and the brightest of the Polish Army—I requested this House to authorize the reprinting of the 1952 report to the House Select Committee which investigated this enormous crime. That report found that the truth about the Katyn Forest atrocities was covered up, suppressed, and distorted by the then-Soviet Government and by well-intentioned but wrong Allied officials. I urge my colleagues to read that report, which is available from the Committee on House Administration.

Now, the Polish Government has finally acknowledged that the Stalin government and Stalin's NKVD were responsible. That is the conclusion that the Select Committee reached in 1952. Finally, a 45-year effort to conceal the truth and cover up the responsibility has ended.

Mr. Speaker, it is long past the time for the truth to be told, but it is finally being told. The new winds sweeping through the Communist bloc will expose the crimes of the old governments and perhaps begin the process of healing some festering wounds.

Mr. Speaker, I include an article from the New York Times of March 8, 1989, which reports the present conclusion of the Polish Government that the Katyn Forest Massacre was carried out by the Soviet secret police:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 8, 1989]

POLAND OFFICIALLY SHIFTS THE BLAME TO SOVIETS FOR WARTIME MASSACRE

(By John Tagliabue)

WARSAW, March 7.—Poland's Government said today that Soviet forces were responsible for a massacre of Polish officers during World War II.

The charge, made by the Government's spokesman, Jerzy Urban, represented a basic shift in the official Government position in rejecting what for 45 years has been the official Soviet version of the crime—namely, that it was Nazi German soldiers who killed the 4,443 Polish officers whose bodies were found in mass graves 45 years ago in the Katyn Forest, near Smolensk.

Mr. Urban said, "We believe that everything indicates the crime was committed by the Stalinist N.K.V.D." the initials for the Soviet secret police in the Stalinist period.

The accusation came in response to a question from a Polish reporter on the work of a joint Soviet-Polish historical commission. Mr. Urban's response appeared to have been carefully prepared, as is often the case when the Government wishes to make a formal pronouncement on a weighty issue.

The Soviet Union has always admitted that the Poles found at Katyn were among 15,000 reserve officers originally seized by Soviet forces in 1939, when the Soviet Army took Eastern Poland under the terms of the

Hitler-Stalin pact. Successive Communist governments in Warsaw have adhered to the Soviet version that the Germans executed the officers in 1941 after over-running the Soviet camp where the Poles had been held. But repeated investigations have found strong evidence that Soviet soldiers killed the Polish officers found at Katyn, shooting each in the back of the head.

The other 10,600 Polish officers vanished.

COINCIDES WITH TALKS ON FUTURE

Few issues go to the heart of Polish-Soviet relations as deeply as the Katyn massacre, in which many Poles believe Stalin wiped out the flower of Poland's leadership. The resonance of the killings has gone beyond Poland to the West, figuring on the lists of Stalin's most heinous crimes, and their coverup as one of the most malicious instances of the Soviet manipulation of history.

In recent weeks, several Polish newspapers have published reports suggesting that the massacre was carried out by the Soviets. Last week, the Polish Foreign Minister, Tadeusz Olechowski, addressing Parliament, urged the Soviet Union to disclose the truth about the killings.

The statement, coming as the Government continued its delicate talks about Poland's future with the opposition movement surrounding the Solidarity trade union, appeared to put the onus of admission on Moscow.

[In Moscow, the Russian-language service of the Soviet press agency Tass distributed a four-paragraph report on Mr. Urban's news conference that made no reference to his remarks about the massacre. The Tass report dealt only with the talks between Solidarity and the Government.]

PACE OF COMMISSION'S WORK

When the Polish leader, Gen. Wojciech Jaruzelski, announced in 1987 that a joint commission was being established to illuminate the "blank spots" in Polish-Soviet affairs, hopes were raised in Poland that Soviet glasnost might at last help reveal fate of the thousands of missing Polish officers. The commission is also examining the 1939 Hitler-Stalin pact by which Russia and Nazi Germany agreed to divide Poland, and the actions of Soviet forces in the 1944 Warsaw uprising when—according to many Poles and most Western historians—Red Army units waited to permit Nazi troops to crush the resistance of pro-Western insurgents and raze the city.

Poland's decision to move ahead and make disclosures on Katyn appears to signal official dissatisfaction with the slow pace of the commission's work. Mr. Urban acknowledged that the Soviet historians in the commission "rightly" claimed that the materials presented by the Poles—consisting essentially of Red Cross reports on the discovery of the graves—represented only "circumstantial evidence," and that the Soviet historians sought their own evidence in Soviet archives. But he said the Polish Government sought a "higher pace" to the work.

STALIN ACCUSED GERMANS

After German forces exhumed the bodies in 1943, the Germans contended the men had been executed in 1940 by Soviet troops.

Stalin responded that the Germans themselves had executed the officers. When the Polish Government in exile in London demanded an explanation, Stalin used the affair as a pretext to sever relations and to establish a Polish government that became the precursor of today's regime.

For Poles, Katyn has long been a matter of national honor, and a challenge to the claim to legitimacy raised by the present Communist regime. In 1981, at the height of the Solidarity movement, a monument to those killed in Katyn was erected in a Warsaw cemetery, only to be removed by the police when the union was crushed by martial law later that year.

PROPOSED CLOSURE OF CHANUTE AIR FORCE BASE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADIGAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 22, 1989, I testified before the House Armed Services Committee Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities in strong opposition to the proposed closure of Chanut Air Force Base. I would like to bring to the attention of my fellow Members the major inaccuracies in the Commission's report regarding Chanut, and to state that the quality and availability of facilities at Chanut directly contradict the closure recommendation. I would welcome any questions Members may have on this matter:

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSMAN ED MADIGAN IN SUPPORT OF CHANUTE AIR FORCE BASE, MILITARY INSTALLATIONS AND FACILITIES SUBCOMMITTEE, FEBRUARY 22, 1989

Madam Chairwoman and Members of the Subcommittee: I want to thank you for the opportunity to testify today. As you know, Chanut Air Force Base which is located in my congressional district, has been recommended for closure by the Commission on Base Closure and Realignment.

I strongly challenge the Commission's recommendation. I do so as someone who has been to Chanut many times and seen firsthand its growth and its potential. No member of the Commission or its staff went to Chanut. No member of the Commission or its staff ever talked with Chanut officials.

The Commission report issued in late December states that Chanut has "a shortage of buildings for training and administration purposes, maintenance, and warehousing . . . a shortage of family housing units, bachelor housing, recreational amenities, and medical and dental facilities." Any one familiar with Chanut would fail to recognize this as a description of Chanut. These statements are blatantly untrue. Without a doubt, the most outrageous statement by the Commission is that "this closure will have moderate impact on local employment."

Today, I would like to provide the subcommittee with accurate information regarding Chanut and the devastating impact a closure would have on this rural area of Illinois. I would also like to share with you the enormous difficulty I have experienced in my efforts to obtain the information used by the Commission in reaching its conclusion that Chanut should be closed.

Chanut AFB is located on 2,125 acres in Rantoul, Illinois, 15 miles north of Champaign/Urbana. On three sides, it is bordered by farmland which would easily accommodate further expansion of the base. It is a technical training center providing training in missile and aircraft mechanics; aerospace ground equipment; aircrew life support systems; fabrication and parachute repair and maintenance; general and special purpose

vehicle maintenance; airframe repair; metallurgy and nondestructive inspection; weather forecasting; weather equipment; and fire training in structural fire and aircraft crash and rescue. Individual and military technical training is provided for officers and airmen of the Air Force, Air Force Reserve, Air National Guard, Air Force civilian employees and other Department of Defense agencies. Officers and airmen from 25 allied countries are trained at Chanut. Chanut graduates 24,000 students each year from 168 resident courses.

Chanut is designated as the central Defense Department fire protection and rescue training center and the primary MX missile maintenance training center. All Department of Defense and Coast Guard weather specialists receive their training at Chanut. The quality of its work is well known throughout the Air Force and Chanut has a record of achieving top results. Chanut-trained people have earned the reputation for being the backbone of the Air Force's Aerospace Maintenance Team. The internationally known Jet Engine Accident Investigation Course is only one of several advanced technical training courses taught at Chanut. It also provides principal training courses in the maintenance of intercontinental ballistic, air and ground launched cruise, and attack missile systems.

Contrary to the Base Closure Commission, the training facilities at Chanut are adequate, fully utilized and can even be expanded. Many new training facilities have been recently completed. And one, the new \$6.8 million weather training facility will be completed this spring.

In fact, the Air Force recently expanded Chanut's mission through its Rivet Workforce program. Two courses were merged and moved to Chanut. The metals corrosion training currently taught at Sheppard AFB, Texas, was merged with the airframe repair specialty into a single curriculum with state-of-the-art repair and protection techniques. All training in basic aircraft and munitions maintenance officer courses is being consolidated at Chanut, moving the basic munitions officer course from Lowry AFB, Colorado.

Perhaps when people think of a training center, they visualize classrooms with neat rows of desks. Under these conditions, using square footage as a kind of measurement might have some value. However, when rating a technical training center, it is meaningless. Tearing down a jet engine is not a classroom procedure with an instructor and a class full of students. It is highly specialized hands-on training with a small teacher-student ratio. And, it requires a building designed to meet the specialized training requirements. Chanut has a new jet engine training center; a new fire training center; a new liquid fuels center; a new weather training center; and an aerospace ground equipment training center, which was completed in 1973.

There are two Minuteman silos—one above ground and one below ground covered by a 40-ton lid. It is enormously expensive to duplicate these already existing and paid for specialized facilities at other bases. Boeing estimates that the cost of moving this one silo alone is \$20 million, and that is cheaper than building a new one. I would like to point out that Chanut is the only base which teaches the Minuteman system maintenance program and the only base with inactive silos for training purposes. I think it is very important to keep training and readiness separate.

The Commission claims a shortage of buildings at Chanute for administration. Before the Pentagon was built, White Hall at Chanute was the largest administration building in the military. It is now the second largest. Inside you will find over ten acres of space. The Commission also claims there is a shortage of maintenance and warehousing buildings. Using the Commission's own rule of square footage, the alleged shortage of maintenance space is around 750 square feet—the size of a small apartment. Chanute has adequate warehousing for its needs and has never reached a point where it has been necessary to request additional facilities.

Chanute has consistently earned top honors. In recent years, the base has received awards for energy efficiency and conservation, the Hennessey Trophy three times for Best in the Air Force Food Service, ATC Outstanding Services Squadron, ATC Family Housing Branch of the Year, ATC Medical Logistics Award for the Chanute Hospital. Its outstanding Arts and Crafts facility has been named the model for all Air Force installations. In addition, Air Force Excellence Awards have been won for its Best in the Air Force library, youth activities program, education services, security police, retiree affairs program, family housing management office, Best Small Commissary in the North Central Region, and the Ohio Valley Base Exchange Award. In 1988 alone, Chanute earned 44 of the 80 awards given by ATC. I cite these awards to show that Chanute has not been a mediocre or marginal base. It has been a top caliber base with one of the strongest community relations programs I have seen.

With a younger population of students, Chanute AFB has been exceptionally sensitive to quality of life conditions. The recreational programs and facilities of Chanute are among the finest in the Air Force, and include athletics, hobbies, hunting, fishing, and social activities. The Chanute Athletic complex consists of three gymnasiums, two swimming pools, 14 outdoor tennis courts, two recreation courts, eight softball fields, two running tracks, and a soccer field. The Athletic Forum has eight air-conditioned racquetball courts, Nautilus free-weight room, saunas and steam rooms. The Fitness Center provides individual or group fitness programs. Aerobics and martial arts classes are available. The Sports Arena has an indoor running track, tennis courts and racquetball courts. The base also provides a skeet range, 18-hole golf course, and a 32-lane bowling center. The base has a large stocked lake with two covered pavilions. As mentioned above, the Chanute Arts and Crafts facility is a model for the entire Air Force. The youth center offers a television room, arts and crafts, a game room, snack bar and large gymnasium/multi-purpose room. The youth sports program offers basketball, bowling, cheerleading, football, golf, T-ball and soccer. Classes are available for karate, tap, baton, dance, gymnastics and piano. It is absolutely unbelievable that the Closure Commission would cite this base as lacking in recreational amenities.

The Commission states there is a shortage of family housing units and bachelor housing. Since FY82, \$30 million has been spent to upgrade and maintain Chanute's housing. The base has 1,346 family housing units and 95 mobile home spaces. There is an excess 1,000 bed modern dormitory at the base that is not being used at this time. Chanute has a total dormitory capacity of 5,900 beds. One modern 100-room bachelor officers

quarters is in use. A new 100-room bachelor officers quarters is over half complete. In the nearby community of Rantoul, there is a seven percent excess of available rental units. Just this month, it was announced that Chanute's Military Family Housing office took second place in Air Force-wide competition. For two consecutive years, the Chanute Housing Office has been the Best in ATC.

The Commission also stated there is a shortage of medical and dental facilities. There is an under-utilized hospital at Chanute. The Commission report on the hospital size is incorrect. The hospital currently uses 35 inpatient beds. It has medical/surgical, obstetrics/gynecology, and special care nursing unit capability. The hospital enjoys a good reputation for meeting the varied medical needs of both the younger active duty personnel and the large number of retired military who live in the community. It has an excellent emergency room. However, the base is unable to use the entire third floor of its hospital due to a lack of available Air Force physicians and staff. With the third floor in use, this hospital can expand to a 130 bed facility. May I mention again that in November 1988, Chanute was rated as having the outstanding medical logistics account in the Air Force for hospitals in the 26-50 bed category.

Across the street from the hospital, there is a modern dental clinic. Outpatient care is available by appointment, and there is an active duty clinic in the late afternoons to accommodate those with training schedules. Emergency care is provided around the clock. Comprehensive dental services are offered, including a plaque control program. I have been told by Air Force personnel that this is the best dental program they have encountered in their years of service.

The Commission declares that closing Chanute would only have a "moderate impact on local employment." If that statement weren't so tragically wrong, it would be laughable. Local community leaders equate the closing of Chanute with the impact of Detroit losing its three major automobile manufacturers.

As of December 28, 1988, there are 3,185 officer, enlisted, and civilian assigned on permanent party status at Chanute plus 800 contract civilian personnel. There are 2,786 students. The Economic Impact Region for Chanute is the 50-mile commuting radius from the center of the base. This area covers all or parts of 13 counties in Illinois and two in Indiana.

The combined salaries of the military (\$87,392,139) and civilian (\$36,199,029) employees on Chanute total \$123,591,168. Chanute is the largest employer in Rantoul, a community of 20,700. In this community alone, 8,000 people have Chanute-related jobs. Applying Air Force methodology of estimating local economic impact, \$119,542,603 of Chanute cash-flow dollars was spent in the Rantoul area. Chanute is the second largest employer in the home county of Champaign, second only to the University of Illinois. This alone would indicate a major impact. However, there are other economic factors I would like to bring to your attention.

There are 4,614 military retirees residing in the 50-mile radius, and military retirement pay received totals \$45,509,688.

Twenty-five percent of the Combined Federal Campaign contributions collected go into Champaign County. Last year the county received \$44,668,000.

The prestigious University of Illinois has done a preliminary regional economic

impact study on the proposed closure. Contrary to the Commission's report, this independent study states that closure would produce a major negative impact on regional sales, employment, income, school enrollment and demand for housing. An extensive study is underway and a thorough regional analysis will be available from the University in 90 days.

As can be expected, the local real estate market in the immediate area surrounding the base is suffering. Only one house has been sold since the proposed closure was announced in late December, and that was due to a family being burned out. Property values have dropped and owners have lost equity. I am in the process of trying to find out how many Chanute-related people own their own homes, how much the Defense Department buyout program is going to cost, and the impact on area savings and loan institutions which hold these mortgages. Even now, the Air Force and the Army Corps of Engineers are trying to estimate how many homes will be required to be purchased and what the cost will be. Because this is not yet known, it could not have been included in the Commission's study.

Particularly hard hit by a closure would be the local school system in the immediate area of the base. Rantoul City Schools will be forced to close 4 of its 6 schools. Elementary school enrollment will drastically decline with a loss of 65 percent of its students. The high school will lose 43 percent of its students. By coincidence, the percentage of teachers required to be released is 65 percent in the elementary schools and 43 percent in the high schools. This is not a moderate impact.

Among the total 13 affected school districts, 39 percent of its students will be lost, \$1.7 million in federal income and \$3.6 million in state income.

Because of the average age of local teaching faculties and the economic pressures on all schools in Illinois, over half of the tenured teachers who will be released will have too much experience to be reemployed as teachers in Illinois. These are teachers with more than 10 years experience. With the Illinois Teacher Retirement System requiring 20 years of credit to receive significant benefits, all of these career teachers are facing an extraordinarily difficult future.

The Commission report cites an \$8 million savings by closing the Willard Airport in Campaign/Urbana and moving this civilian airport to Chanute. I would like to point out that there are no facilities—no tower, lights or radar—at Chanute. The airport they would close is fully operational with ILS, radar, a 10,000 foot runway, where \$88 million has been spent in the past five years. It has an existing passenger terminal, and a new terminal is under construction. None of these facilities and equipment exist at Chanute.

Although Chanute is the third oldest installation and the oldest technical training center in the Air Force, it has been continuously changing to meet the needs of modern day life and technology. Major improvements have been made over the past ten years. Nearly \$150 million in capital improvements have been made. These include a new commissary; two new dormitories for unaccompanied officers, one of which is 50 percent complete; a new unaccompanied enlisted dormitory with dining hall; renovation of four dormitories for enlisted students; upgraded military family housing; a \$3.3 million gymnasium; an arts and crafts

center; a youth center; a branch exchange shopette; a branch exchange gas station; a base recreational lake and park; a new fire protection training complex; expansion of the jet engine training facility; cold storage facility; a new weather training facility; liquid fuels training facility; energy conservation investment program; heat plant emission control; data processing facility and the upgrade of steam lines for the central heating plant.

The Commission states that closing Chanute will save \$68.7 million annually. From my figures, that equals the amount needed to operate and maintain the base each year plus the cost of family housing. But, what will it really cost to close Chanute?

According to an article in the *Air Force Times* (January 23, 1989), Chanute would be the second costliest base to close, requiring the expenditure of \$186.4 million at four other bases. The *Air Force Times* provided the following breakout of this exorbitant expense: Beginning in early 1990, Sheppard AFB, Texas, would receive \$82 million for construction projects; Goodfellow AFB, Texas, would receive \$35.4 million in construction projects; Keesler AFB, Mississippi, would receive \$13.2 million in construction projects; and Lowry AFB, Colorado, would receive \$55.8 million in construction projects. I do not believe that spending \$186.4 million to save \$68.7 million makes any fiscal sense. Other available data reflects \$240 million in new construction costs. What is the true cost?

There are other major factors which I feel will have a strong bearing on any possible cost savings, and I have requested the General Accounting Office to investigate the following.

There is a joint military/civilian regional sewage treatment agreement between Chanute and the Village of Rantoul. What would be the buyout costs associated with the Air Force terminating this agreement?

The Air Force has entered into a contract with the Sun Law Energy Corporation for steam to heat approximately 120 of the base's 871 buildings. The terms of the agreement with Sun Law require them to furnish, install, own, operate and maintain the steam plant. The Air Force is committed to purchase steam from Sun Law as a utility for a period of 27 years through the year 2017.

According to the information I received from the Department of the Air Force in May 1988, should Chanute be closed, the contract states specific amounts the Government would be obligated to pay Sun Law in the event of cancellation prior to the year 2011. In 1988, the amount would be \$4,500,000; in 1989, it would be \$44,278,000; and \$84,278,000 in 1990. In each year thereafter, the amount would decrease by approximately approximately \$2-\$7 million. The plant is to be fully complete in 1990, resulting in the highest termination cost for that year.

How much will it cost to move Chanute courses, personnel and equipment to the recommended receiving bases?

Relocation of major Chanute units and related support activities has been recommended to go the Sheppard, Keesler, Lowry, and Goodfellow AFBs. What are the new construction costs required in the areas of housing, instructional facilities, medical and recreation required to enable these receiving bases to accommodate the transfers from Chanute?

How much is it estimated that the Department of Defense will have to pay under the home buyout program?

There are three civilian contracts at Chanute: Food Service, Maintenance Squadron, and Base Motor Pool. What are the termination costs of buying out these three contracts, which employ 800 civilian personnel who are not government employees?

Another major concern I have involves the hazardous material asbestos. Chanute has 871 buildings and the probability of many of these buildings containing asbestos is high. If the base is closed and these buildings are not cleaned up, which I understand is a very expensive process, then they may very well be rendered useless.

Madam Chairwoman, for national security reasons, I do not have any faith in a report that recommends closure of the only base which provides Minuteman missile maintenance training. I do not have any faith in a report that so falsely states that there would only be a moderate economic impact. This rural Illinois community is fighting for its very life, and I am committed to this fight.

I have been denied basic information on the rationale for Chanute closure recommendation. I have been forced to file Freedom of Information requests with both the Base Closure Commission and the Department of the Air Force. To date, neither the Commission or the department has been able to provide me with a direct answer to a very simple question: What is the justification for the closure recommendation for Chanute? I cannot get any straight answers. There is no accountability.

I think it is clear that there will not be any cost savings achieved in the event Chanute AFB is indeed closed. It is impossible to recover those costs of building new specialized facilities and moving personnel and equipment to other bases from the savings alleged to be achieved from the closing of Chanute.

I have provided a film on Chanute, which I hope the subcommittee will be able to view. At this time, I extend a personal invitation once again to you, Madam Chairwoman, and to all members of the subcommittee, to come with me to Chanute for a tour of this facility.

Chanute is an experienced, top caliber facility with proven dedication to high quality training. It is accomplishing its mission and should be allowed to continue to do so.

The Air Force estimates that the closing of Chanute and the moving of the equipment can result in a six-month period when these training courses will not be taught since they are base specific, hands-on courses and the training equipment necessary for instruction in these courses does not exist at any other facility.

In summary, the cost of new construction at receiving installations, the cost of moving personnel and facilities from Chanute, the cost of the housing buyout, the steam plant, the sewage plant, and the asbestos cleanup all make savings in a six year timeframe by closing Chanute impossible.

My constituents have all this information. They know that Chanute should not be on this list. At this point, I can only ask the subcommittee members what advice they have for me in responding to the concerns of the people I represent.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. GONZALEZ addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. DE LA GARZA addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

COMMITTEE PROCESS REFORMS OF 1989

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mrs. MARTIN] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing the "Committee Process Reforms of 1989," a package of 14 amendments to House rules designed to revitalize our committee system.

The acronym for "committee process reforms" is CPR, and that's exactly what our atrophied committee system needs—a little cardiopulmonary resuscitation. Committees are supposed to constitute the very heart of the legislative process. And yet today they are suffering from hardened arteries, clogged valves and tangled veins, making it extremely difficult for the well-regulated and healthy flow of legislation.

My colleagues are well familiar with the reasons for the decline of our committee system. Committees have been squeezed out by the budget and appropriations process, entangled in the proliferation of subcommittees and turf battles, and forced by 3-day workweeks and Members' multiple committee and subcommittee assignments to resort to miniquorums and ghost-voting. Not only are committees not able to complete their routine authorization work, but they are not even attempting to conduct any kind of systematic oversight of laws, programs and agencies already in existence.

LEGISLATIVE OUTPUT

One might think that committees are unable to complete their work because they are overburdened with more legislation than ever before. But such a hypothesis is not borne out by the facts. As table 1 demonstrates, in the 100th Congress, the number of public bills reported by House committees was 718, 48 percent fewer than the 90th Congress and 31 percent fewer than the 95th Congress. The House passed 1,061 measures in the 100th Congress, 12.5 percent fewer than 20 years ago, but 3.3 percent more than 10 years ago.

Looking at this data in another way, whereas 20 years ago the ratio of measures reported to measures passed was 1.12, and 10 years ago was 1.02, in the 100th Congress the ratio was 0.68. In other words, for every three measures we pass, only two have been reported.

The number of public measures enacted was actually up in the 100th Congress at 713, 11.4 percent more than 20 years ago and 12.6 percent more than 10 years ago. This figure, however, is somewhat deceptive when you consider that so-called commemorative bills comprised 36 percent of the public laws

in the 100th Congress compared to 5.3 percent in the 90th and 8.2 percent in the 95th. When one weeds out the commemorative legislation, we are left with only 455 substantive enactments in the 100th Congress compared with 606 in the 90th and 581 in the 95th.

TABLE 1.—COMPARATIVE LEGISLATIVE DATA FOR HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FOR 90TH, 95TH, AND 100TH CONGRESSES

Item	90th Cong. 1967-68	95th Cong. 1977-78	100th Cong. 1987-88
Days in session ¹	328	323	298
Hours in session ¹	1,595	1,898	1,659
Average hours per day	4.9	5.9	5.6
Total public measures reported ²	1,369	1,044	718
Public measures reported but not acted upon ²	58	72	69
Total public measures passed ²	1,213	1,027	1,061
Ratio of public measures reported to passed	1.12	1.02	0.68
Total public laws enacted ²	640	633	713
Average pages per statute ²	3.6	8.5	NA
Commemoratives enacted ²	(34)	(52)	(258)
Commemoratives as percent of total enactments	(5.3)	(8.2)	(36)
Substantive laws (total minus commemoratives) ²	606	581	455
Rollcall votes ²	488	1,540	939
Average votes per measure passed ²	29	95	62
Congressional Record pages of House Proceedings	27,390	26,929	24,368
Average record pages per measure passed ²	16.5	16.6	16.2
House standing committees	21	22	22
Select committees ²	1	9	6
Subcommittees ²	114	154	157
House committee staff ²	629	2,111	2,085
House appropriations ² (in millions of dollars)	165	563	1,131

Footnotes:

¹ Data taken from "Resume of Congressional Activity," Daily Digest, Congressional Records, & House Calendars, 90th, 95th, & 100th Congresses. "Public measures" are bills and joint resolutions of a public nature, and do not include private bills, nor do they include simple or concurrent resolutions.

² Source: "Indicators of House of Representatives Workload and Activity," CRS Report for Congress by Roger H. Davidson and Carol Hardy, June 8, 1987 (87-492 S).

³ Commemoratives are isolated here as a subcategory of public laws, to be distinguished from more substantive enactments. The term "commemoratives" includes proclamations, commemorations, memorials, namings, coins and medals, and recognitions. Sources: Calendars of the House, 90th, 95th, and 100th Congresses; and Congressional Record, Nov. 10, 1988, Daily Digest and History of Bills Enacted into Public Law.

⁴ "Rollcall votes" include yea and nay votes and recorded votes, but not recorded quorum calls. Prior to 1971, recorded votes were not permitted on amendments in the Committee of the Whole. Sources: Daily Digest, "Resume of

Congressional Activity," final Congressional Records for 90th, 95th, and 100th Congresses.

⁵ "Measures passed" here includes not only bills and joint resolutions, but simple and concurrent resolutions as well.

⁶ Select committees include two ad hoc legislative committees in the 95th Congress and the Iran-Contra select committee in the 100th Congress.

⁷ Subcommittees include the subcommittees, panels and task forces of standing and select committees. Sources: The "Final Report," Select Committee on Committees, April, 1980 (H. Rept. 96-866) for the 90th and 95th Congresses; "List of Standing Committee and Select Committees and Their Subcommittees, 100th Congress," Office of the Clerk; and telephone inquiries.

⁸ Figures for staff include statutory and investigative staff of all House standing and select committees plus H.I.S. staff. Sources: "Final Report," Select Committee on Committees, April, 1980 (H. Rept. 96-866) for the 90th and 95th Congresses; "Congressional Committee Staff and Funding," by Carol Hardy, Congressional Research Service (Aug. 10, 1988) and House Administration Committee minority staff for 100th Congress.

⁹ Figures represent the budget authority appropriated for the House in the Legislative Branch Appropriations bills for the 90th (1967-68), 95th (1977-78), and 100th (1987-88) Congresses, first and second sessions combined. Source: "U.S. House of Representatives and Senate: Budget Authority FY 1962-FY 1988," by Paul Dwyer, Congressional Research Service (Repl. No. 88-260 GOV).

SUBCOMMITTEES AND STAFF

One of the most dramatic developments of the past two decades has been the tremendous growth in House subcommittees and staff. While bolstering congressional staff and resources was seen as a long overdue reform to give the Congress a more coequal status with the executive branch, there comes a time when we reach a point of diminishing returns—we end up with more staff and subcommittees than our finite number of 435 Members can manage or absorb.

As table 1 shows, the number of subcommittees in the House has increased from 114 to 157 over the last 20 years, a 37.7-percent increase, and the number of committee staff from 629 to 2,087, a 231-percent increase. Committee costs over that same period have risen from \$165 million per Congress to \$1.13 billion, a 585-percent increase.

It's all well and good that over half the majority Members have their own little fiefdoms and can go by the title of "chairman," but it's quite another thing to make that sprawling system of subcommittees and staff work for the good of the whole. A survey of House Members by the Center for Responsive Politics last year reveals that 67.8 percent think

the number of subcommittees should be reduced. And roughly half the Members think more stringent limits should be placed on subcommittee staff and Member subcommittee assignments.

In short, Mr. Speaker, Members recognize the need for a leaner, more streamlined committee system if it is to be made to work effectively in the future.

MEMBER ASSIGNMENTS

Not only does the proliferation of subcommittees contribute to institutional and legislative fragmentation, but it strains the capacities of Members to do a conscientious job. It is not unusual to hear Members complain that they are simultaneously scheduled for three or more committee or subcommittee meetings or hearings each day.

Some decide to give one such hearing or meeting priority over the others. Other Members try to spend a little bit of time in each, in part to register their attendance, and in part to get at least some flavor of what's going on. But seldom do any of us feel that we are responsibly fulfilling our roles on any one of these units given the conflicting demands being made on our limited time.

As table 2 below indicates, the mean number of committee and subcommittee assignments per House Member has gradually increased from about 5 in the 90th Congress, 20 years ago, to 6.3 in the 95th Congress, 10 years ago, to 6.95 in the 100th Congress (1987-88).

Is it any wonder that Members often feel they are on a treadmill and look back at the end of a long and exhausting day and wonder what they really learned or accomplished on that day? I recall one survey which found that the average House Member worked an 11-hour day, of which 11 minutes were devoted to reading and thinking. One Member reacted, only half jokingly, "I wonder who is using my 11 minutes?" It might be funnier if it weren't so true.

TABLE 2.—U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS: 79TH-100TH CONGRESSES ¹

(Reprinted from "Indicators of House of Representatives Workload and Activity," Roger H. Davidson and Carol Hardy, CRS report, June 8, 1987)

Congress	Total number of assignments ²				Mean number of standing committee assignments	Mean number of subcommittee assignments	Mean number of select, special and joint assignments	Total mean number of committee assignments
	Standing Committee	Subcomm. of standing Committee	Select, special and joint Committee ³	Total				
79 (1945-46)	941	752	113	1,806	2.16	1.73	0.26	4.15
80 (1947-48)	482	742	56	1,280	1.11	1.71	.13	2.94
81 (1949-50)	481	533	66	1,080	1.11	1.23	.15	2.48
82 (1951-52)	491	611	78	1,180	1.13	1.41	.18	2.71
83 (1953-54)	526	570	66	1,262	1.21	1.54	.15	2.90
84 (1955-56)	542	765	116	1,423	1.25	1.76	.27	3.27
85 (1957-58)	549	975	145	1,669	1.26	2.24	.33	3.84
86 (1959-60)	575	1,095	144	1,814	1.32	2.51	.33	4.15
87 (1961-62)	584	1,128	161	1,873	1.34	2.58	.37	4.29
88 (1963-64)	594	1,211	137	1,942	1.37	2.78	.32	4.46
89 (1965-66)	602	1,274	171	2,047	1.38	2.93	.39	4.71
90 (1967-68)	613	1,378	187	2,178	1.41	3.17	.43	5.01
91 (1969-70)	637	1,403	186	2,226	1.46	3.23	.43	5.12
92 (1971-72)	674	1,450	216	2,340	1.54	3.32	.49	5.36
93 (1973-74)	710	1,531	261	2,502	1.62	3.49	.60	5.70
94 (1975-76)	770	1,719	210	2,699	1.75	3.92	.48	6.15
95 (1977-78)	776	1,716	259	2,751	1.77	3.91	.59	6.27
96 (1979-80)	764	1,692	242	2,698	1.74	3.85	.55	6.15
97 (1981-82)	757	1,564	235	2,556	1.72	3.56	.53	5.81
98 (1983-84)	765	1,710	277	2,752	1.74	3.89	.63	6.26
99 (1985-86)	781	1,734	323	2,838	1.77	3.94	.74	6.45
100 (1987-88)	807	1,822	431	3,060	1.83	4.14	.98	6.95

¹ Sources: Data for the 79th Cong. are compiled from U.S. Congress, Joint Committees on the Organization of Congress. Hearings, 79th Cong., 1st Sess., Mar. 13-June 29, 1945. Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office 1945. p. 1084; data for the 80th through 83rd Congress are compiled from U.S. Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service, Standing Committee Structure and Assignments: House and Senate, Report No. 82-42 GOV, by Sula P. Richardson and Susan Schielderup, Washington, 1982. p. 77; and data for the 84th through the 100th Congress are compiled from information taken from yearly volumes of Brownson, "Congressional Staff Directory"; Congressional Quarterly, "Congressional Quarterly Almanac"; and "CD Weekly Report"; the Monitor Publishing Co., the "Congressional Yellow Book," spring, 1987 ed., West Publishing Co., "U.S. Code Congressional and Administrative News"; and lists of committee assignments published by the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

² These figures include statutory members of the Chamber who participate in committee and subcommittee activities. As of the 100th Cong., this group includes four Delegates and one Resident Commissioner.

³ These totals include all House members of select, special and joint committees and their subcommittees.

[Reprinted from "Indicators of House of Representatives Workload and Activity," Roger H. Davidson and Carol Hardy, CRS Report, June 8, 1987]

SPECIAL RULES AND RATIOS

As I previously mentioned, one of the reasons committees are declining is that Members have so many committee, subcommittee

and other responsibilities that they cannot devote sufficient time to any one legislative assignment. As a result of our limited work-week and multiple assignments, committees have been permitted under House rules to conduct business with as few as one-third of their Members present. The exception to this is the reporting of a measure, for which at

least half the members must be present. And committees are authorized to adopt committee rules which permit proxy voting.

As can be seen in table 2, 18 of our 27 standing and select committees permit one-third quorums, while only nine do not. And 22 of our standing and select committees permit proxy voting while only 5 prohibit it.

TABLE 3.—HOUSE COMMITTEE SURVEY, 100TH CONGRESS

Committee	Proxy voting ¹	One-third quorums ²	Number of subcommittees ³	Number of staff: 1988 ⁴	Investigative staff budget: 1988 ⁵
Agriculture	Yes	Yes ⁶	8	63	\$1,111,111
Appropriations	No	No	13	198	NA ⁷
Armed Services	Yes	Yes	11	69	1,657,528
Banking, Finance	Yes	Yes	8	97	3,092,883
Budget	Yes	No	8	112	NA
D.C.	Yes	Yes	3	38	298,609
Education and Labor	Yes	Yes	8	120	3,250,922
Energy and Commerce	Yes	Yes	6	141	4,746,248
Foreign Affairs	Yes	Yes	8	98	2,748,528
Government Operations	Yes	Yes	7	77	2,731,633
House Administration	Yes	Yes	7	54	1,109,634
Interior	Yes	Yes	6	70	1,670,958
Judiciary	Yes	Yes	7	79	1,923,722
Merchant Marine	Yes	Yes	6	74	1,974,493
Post Office and CS	Yes	Yes	7	80	1,495,536
Public Works	Yes	Yes	6	80	2,152,890
Rules	No	No	2	41	583,984
Science and Technology	Yes	Yes	8	74	2,220,240
Small Business	Yes	Yes	6	56	925,808
Standards of Official Conduct	No	No	0	10	400,000
Veterans Affairs	No	No	5	41	560,932
Ways and Means	Yes	No	6	94	3,326,487
Select Committees:					
Aging	Yes	Yes	6	34	1,338,367
Children, Youth, and Families	Yes	No	0	18	688,308
Hunger	Yes	No	2	15	588,995
Intelligence	No	No	3	21	58,000
Narcotics	Yes	Yes	0	14	632,892
Total:					
Yes	22	18	157	1,868	42,198,708
No	5	9			

¹ House rule XI, clause 2(f) permits proxy voting in committee if authorized by written rule adopted by the committee. Source for survey on proxies: "Rules Adopted by the Committees of the House of Representatives, 100th Congress," Rules Committee Print.

² House rule XI, clause 2(h) permits committees other than Appropriations, Budget, and Ways and Means, to set the quorum for doing business other than reporting measures, issuing subpoenas, and closing meetings and hearings, at not less than one-third of the membership. Source: same as ff. 1.

³ This figure includes long-term task forces and panels (more than 6 mos.). Sources: House Phone Directory (Spring, 1988); and phone inquiries.

⁴ This figure includes statutory and investigative staff. Sources: House Administration Committee; House Phone Directory (Spring, 1988); and Appropriations Committees staff.

⁵ This figure consists only of the money authorized through committee investigative expense resolutions and does not include funding for the 30 staffers (18 professional and 12 clerical staff) each committee is authorized by House rule and statute, and which are funded through the appropriations process. Source: Report on Committee Expense Resolution, 1988, House Resolution 388, (H. Rept. 100-512), Committee on House Administration, March 9, 1988.

⁶ The Agriculture Committee permits a chairman to set a one-third quorum rule if notice is given in advance of a meeting.

⁷ The Committees on Appropriations and Budget receive no investigative staff funds and instead are funded entirely through the appropriations process under an open-ended statutory authorization.

Another problem in reporting representative legislation is the unrepresentative party ratios on some committees. Table 3 shows that while Democrats comprised 59 percent of House membership in the 100th Congress, they held an average of 61 percent of stand-

ing and select committee seats, and that includes the Standards Committee which has a 50-50 majority-minority party makeup. If one looks at the staffing on committees, the majority party edge is even more dramatic: 76 percent to 24 percent. An even more telling

statistic on committee staff is the number of staff per committee member. While the average ratio is 1.9 to 1, one committee has 3.6 staffers per member, and two others have 3.5 staffers per member.

TABLE 4.—MEMBER AND STAFF RATIOS ON HOUSE COMMITTEES, 100TH CONG.

Committee	Total members	Party ratio Democrat/Republican		Total staff	Staff ratio Democrat/Republican		Staff member ratio
		Number	Percent		Number	Percent	
Agriculture	43	26/17	60/40	63	42/21	67/33	1.5
Appropriations	57	35/22	61/39	198	151/47	76/24	3.5
Armed Services	52	31/21	60/40	69	NA		1.3
Banking	51	31/20	61/39	97	76/21	78/22	1.9
Budget	33	20/13	61/39	112	79/33	71/29	3.4
D.C.	12	8/4	67/33	38	30/8	79/21	3.2
Ed and Labor	34	21/13	62/38	120	89/31	74/26	3.5
Energy and Commerce	42	25/17	60/40	141	125/16	89/11	3.4
Foreign Affairs	45	25/17	60/40	98	79/19	81/19	2.2
Government Operations	39	24/15	62/38	77	64/13	83/17	2.0
House Administration	19	12/7	63/37	54	48/6	89/11	2.8
Interior	41	26/15	63/37	70	54/16	77/23	1.7
Judiciary	35	21/14	60/40	79	64/15	81/19	2.3
Merchant Marine	42	25/17	60/40	74	54/20	73/27	1.8
Post Office	22	13/8	59/41	80	62/18	78/22	3.6
Public Works	50	30/20	60/40	80	56/24	70/30	1.6
Rules	13	9/4	69/31	41	32/9	78/22	3.2
Science and Technology	45	27/18	60/40	74	58/16	78/22	1.6
Small Business	45	27/18	60/40	56	42/14	75/25	1.2
Standards	12	6/6	50/50	10	NA		.8
Veterans Affairs	34	21/13	62/38	41	29/12	71/29	1.2
Ways and Means	36	23/13	64/36	94	76/18	81/19	2.6
Select Committees:							
Aging	65	39/36	60/40	34	24/10	71/29	.5
Children, Youth, and Families	30	18/11	60/40	18	11/5	61/28	.6

TABLE 4.—MEMBER AND STAFF RATIOS ON HOUSE COMMITTEES, 100TH CONG.—Continued

Committee	Total members	Party ratio Democrat/Republican		Total staff	Staff ratio Democrat/Republican		Staff member ratio
		Number	Percent		Number	Percent	
Hunger	26	16/10	62/38	15	10/5	67/33	6
Intelligence	17	11/6	65/35	21	NA		1.2
Narcotics	25	15/10	60/40	14	11/3	79/21	6

NA—Not available.

Sources: Committee on House Administration; U.S. House of Representatives Telephone Directory; Congressional Staff Directory.

Note: At the outset of the 100th Cong., there were 258 Democrats and 177 Republicans, giving the majority a 59- to 41-percent share of House seats.

MULTIPLE REFERRALS

Another factor which delays and complicates the legislative process is the system of referring bills to two or more committees having overlapping jurisdictions. The Speaker was first given this authority in the Committee Reform Amendments of 1974, and it first became effective in 1975.

While the original intent of the Bolling committee in its committee reform package was to realign committee jurisdictions along more ra-

tional and functional lines so that multiple referrals would be held to a minimum, the Democratic caucus substitute for the bipartisan package scuttled jurisdictional reform while retaining multiple referrals.

One early assessment of the multiple referral system indicated that multiple referred bills took four times as long to process in committees as singly referred bills, only half the chance of being reported, and only one-third the chance of being passed by the House.

More recent data (see table 5) indicates that things have improved for multiple referred bills. They actually have a higher chance of being reported—in part because so many singly reported measures are taken-up without being reported. But, they still have close to one-third the chance as singly referred bills of being passed—again, in part, for the same reason.

TABLE 5.—REPORT AND PASSAGE OF REFERRED MEASURES, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 1975–1986

[In percentages]

Measures	94th Cong.	95th Cong.	96th Cong.	97th Cong.	98th Cong.	99th Cong.
Reported:						
Singly-referred	97.5	94.6	88.6	86.8	86.2	83.7
Multiply-referred	2.5	5.4	11.4	13.2	13.8	16.3
(N)	(1,495)	(1,490)	(1,286)	(805)	(983)	(839)
Passed:						
Singly-referred	98.5	96.6	94.9	94.2	93.0	94.2
Multiply-referred	1.5	3.4	5.1	5.8	7.0	5.8
(N)	(1,624)	(1,615)	(1,478)	(1,058)	(1,375)	(1,368)
Reported as a percentage of referred:						
Singly-referred	8.0	8.8	12.2	8.2	11.3	10.5
Multiply-referred	3.3	4.4	11.8	11.7	14.0	12.6
All referrals	7.7	8.4	12.2	8.6	11.6	10.8
Passed as a percentage of referred:						
Singly-referred	8.8	9.8	15.1	11.7	17.1	19.2
Multiply-referred	2.2	3.0	6.0	6.7	9.9	7.3
All referrals	8.4	9.1	14.0	11.3	16.3	17.5
Total measures referred (N)	(19,371)	(17,800)	(10,560)	(9,401)	(8,351)	(7,795)

Source: House LEGIS computerized data base.

Reprinted from, "One Bill, Many Committees: Multiple Referrals in the U.S. House of Representatives," by Roger H. Davidson, Walter J. Oleszek, and Thomas Kephart, in "Legislative Studies Quarterly," vol. 13, Feb. 1988.

Most committees have adjusted to this shared jurisdiction situation, and, in many cases, the cross-fertilization process has been healthy for policymaking in the House. But, at the same time, it must be admitted that multiple referrals also result in considerable duplication of effort, not to mention the valuable consumption of time that might better be spent on other jurisdictional areas. It is clear from the discussion in the next section of my special order that committees are failing to do some of their most basic work, and this is in part due to the time spent on multiply referred legislation.

THE AUTHORIZATION BREAKDOWN

Mr. Speaker, the complaint that we are always slow in enacting authorization bills is not a new one. The Appropriations Committee has been coming to the Rules Committee as a routine matter on most of its bills over the last two decades, requesting a waiver of clause 2, rule 21, against numerous provisions in each bill. As my colleagues are aware, clause 2 states that—

No appropriation shall be reported in any General appropriation bill, or shall be in order as an amendment thereto, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law.

In the past the point was often made that the authorization bill in question had passed

the House but had not yet passed the Senate, or cleared the conference committee. But, this claim, is being made less and less. The fact is that fewer authorizations are even being reported, let alone being considered by the House. And yet, we still grant the necessary waivers on the appropriations bills, and fund the unauthorized agencies and programs anyway.

Fiscal year 1988 may have been the worst of all time in terms of unauthorized appropriations. According to a CBO report, that omnibus continuing resolution we enacted in 1987 contained nearly \$45 billion in funding for some 45 unauthorized laws.

But, even when we returned to the more normal way of doing things last year, and passed all 13 appropriations bills separately, we were still not coming anywhere near enacting all the necessary authorization bills. As table 6 below shows, we approached fiscal year 1989 with 97 laws which required authorizations worth approximately \$277 billion. But, when we completed our work for fiscal 1989, nearly one-third of those laws, for which some \$23 billion had been appropriated, had still not been reauthorized. Table 6, which is derived from CBO data, shows the breakdown by House Committee for those unauthorized programs.

TABLE 6.—STATUS OF AUTHORIZATIONS IN FISCAL 1989 BY HOUSE COMMITTEE

[In millions of dollars]

House Committee	Expired laws		Laws not reauthorized	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Agriculture	4	\$1,515.9		
Armed Services	6	210,259.8	1	\$185.1
Banking	5	13,188.2	1	47.0
Education and Labor	11	230.6		
Foreign Affairs	7	10,251.9	3	10,338.4
Government Operations	2	7.5	1	2.4
House Administration	1	14.2	1	15.4
Interior and Insular Affairs	6	1,107.3	2	422.2
Energy and Commerce	28	11,690.3	14	5,122.7
Judiciary	8	5,473.3	3	5,836.2
Merchant Marine	19	3,387.3	4	203.0
Post Office	1	2.0		
Public Works	11	2,518.5	4	583.6
Science, Space and Technology	11	15,238.8	3	4,002.7
Small Business	1	634.0		
Veterans' Affairs	2	65.0		
Ways and Means	3	1,225.1	1	51.2
Intelligence	1	158.3		
Total	97	276,968.0	31	23,124.4

Source: Data derived from Congressional Budget Office, "Reports on Unauthorized Appropriations and Expiring Authorizations," Jan. 15, 1988 and Jan. 15, 1989.

The breakdown of our authorizing process has even led some, such as former CBO Director Alice Rivlin, to propose that the authorization and appropriations committees be

merged to avoid the duplication and delays caused by our three-track budget system. Even the President's National Economic Commission, in its March 1, 1989, report, has not only called for a Joint Budget Committee to force earlier and better coordinated budget action, but, to quote from the report, went on to recommend the following:

Some method should be found to reduce the duplication inherent in the present system of separate authorization and appropriation committees. (p. 11)

WHAT SHOULD BE DONE?

Mr. Speaker, I don't think we need to merge authorizing and appropriation committees to make our system work again. Instead of a radical overhaul of House structure and procedures, we should think in terms of restoring our existing committee system to its rightful working role as the heart of the legislative process. That's what my Committee Process Reforms, or CPR, is all about—getting that heart pumping again.

To do this, we must first cut back on the number of subcommittees, Member assignments, and staff. I have proposed no more than six subcommittee assignments per Member, and a 10-percent overall reduction in committee staff.

To make our committees truly working and representative entities, we must require early organization of committees, enforce equitable party ratios, abolish proxy voting, and restore majority quorums for doing business.

To make the work of our committees more manageable and less duplicative, I have proposed the elimination of joint referrals of bills to two or more committees, while retaining sequential referrals, subject to time limits.

To induce our committees to get their work done early, I am proposing the restoration of the May 15 deadline for reporting authorizations. And, to make it more difficult for unreported bills to come to the floor, I am proposing a two-thirds consideration vote on any rule which provides for the consideration of an unreported bill.

Finally, I am proposing that Congress once again get serious about its oversight responsibilities by requiring each House committee to formally adopt an oversight agenda at the beginning of each Congress, and to ensure that its long term review of laws, agencies and programs within its jurisdiction be conducted in a more systematic manner.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, I don't pretend for a moment that my little package of 14 House rules amendments will restore our committee system overnight. But, I do think it can provide a valuable start in that direction. Ultimately, like so many other things, procedural changes alone will not turn the tide; it will require the political will of Members to make our system work better. But, it is my hope that the reforms I have proposed, together with other proposals, will at least point the way. And maybe, just maybe, where there is a way, there is a will.

At this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I include a paragraph-by-paragraph summary of my committee process reforms. The summary follows:

H. RES. 106, SUMMARY OF "COMMITTEE PROCESS REFORMS OF 1989"

(A resolution introduced by Representative Lynn Martin to amend House Rules "to restore the committee system to its rightful role in the legislative process.")

Sec. 1. Title: "Committee Process Reforms of 1989."

Sec. 2. (a) House Rules would be amended as follows:

(1) Oversight Reform—Committees would be required to formally adopt and submit to the House Administration Committee by March 1st of the first session their oversight plans for that Congress. The House Administration Committee, after consultation with the majority and minority leaders, would report the plans to the House by March 15th together with its recommendations, and those of the joint leadership group to assure coordination between committees. The Speaker would be authorized to appoint ad hoc oversight committees for specific tasks from the membership of committees with shared jurisdiction. Committees would be required to include an oversight section in their final activity report at the end of a Congress.

(2) Multiple Referral of Legislation—The joint referral of bills to two or more committees would be abolished, while split and sequential referrals would be retained, subject to time limits and designation by the Speaker of a committee of principal jurisdiction.

(3) Committee Elections and Organization—Committees would be elected not later than seven legislative days after the convening of a new Congress and must organize not later than three legislative days thereafter.

(4) Committee Ratios—The party ratios on committees would be required to reflect that of the full House (except for Standards of Official Conduct which is bipartisan). The requirement would extend to select and conference committees as well.

(5) Subcommittee Limits—No committee (except appropriations) could have more than six subcommittees, and no Member could have more than four subcommittee assignments.

(6) Proxy Voting Ban—All proxy voting on committees would be prohibited.

(7) Open Meetings—Committee meetings could only be closed by majority vote for national security, personal privacy, or personnel reasons.

(8) Majority Quorums—A majority of the membership of a committee would be required for the transaction of any business.

(9) Report Accountability—The names of those voting for and against reporting measures shall be included in the committee report, and, if a measure is reported on a non-recorded vote, the names of those members actually present shall instead be listed in the committee report.

(10) Prior Availability of Draft Report—A draft committee report must be made available to members at least one legislative day prior to its consideration.

(11) Committee Documents—Committee documents intended for public dissemination, other than factual materials, must either be voted on by the committee and opportunity afforded for additional views, or must carry a disclaimer on their cover that they have not been approved by the committee and do not necessarily reflect the views of its members.

(12) Unreported Bills—It would not be in order, except by two-thirds vote, to consider

a rule in the House on a bill that has not been reported from committee.

(13) Committee Staffing—Committee funding resolutions could not be considered until the House has first adopted a resolution from the House Administration Committee setting an overall limit on committee staffing for the session. The minority would be entitled to up to one-third of the investigative staff funds, on request. The overall committee staff limit for the 101st Congress could not be more than 90% of the total at the end of the 100th Congress.

(14) Authorization Reporting Deadline—Committees would be required to report authorization bills not later than May 15 preceding the beginning of the fiscal year to which they apply.

(b) Effective Date: The provisions of the resolution shall take effect upon adoption, so far as they are applicable.

SHELBYVILLE EAGLETES ACHIEVE UNDEFEATED SEASON

(Mr. COOPER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to praise the achievements of the No. 1 ranked high school girls basketball team in America—the Shelbyville, TN, Golden Eaglettes.

This outstanding team won the Tennessee high school championship last Saturday night, completing a perfect 36-0 season. They are currently ranked No. 1 in the country by USA Today. Coach Rick Insell and his assistants have done a remarkable job again this season, and I congratulate everyone associated with the team. I cannot overstate how proud Shelbyville feels for our girls basketball team.

Mr. Speaker, we often read sad stories about leading athletes in college and high school who fail to make progress in the classroom. That's why I'm especially proud of the Shelbyville girls tradition of excellence both on and off the court. There are four seniors on this year's team with a perfect 4.0 grade point average, and the team's cumulative GPA is an impressive 3.43.

These girls are top scholar athletes who know what hard work and dedication means. They deserve our admiration and praise.

I would like to add the following article taken from the sports pages of the Tennessean on March 8:

SHELBYVILLE: QUEENS OF THE COURT

(By Larry Taft)

SHELBYVILLE, TENN.—As they stroll through the hallways going from one class to another, players on the Shelbyville Central High School girls basketball team are quite inconspicuous.

They chat with male and female friends, and gossip much the same as girls at any other high school do.

Yet, when they take the basketball court, they command the spotlight. When the

Tennessee Secondary School Athletic Association Girls State Basketball Tournament opens in Murfreesboro today, Shelbyville's team will be the main attraction.

Ranked No. 1 in the nation by USA Today, the Golden Eaglettes have embarked on an odyssey that is expected to culminate in a Class AAA state championship Saturday night. Winning has become so commonplace that a game closer than 15 points bring "Ooos" and "Ahhhs" from their legions of fans and hope for the detractors who relish the Eaglettes' fall from their lofty perch.

But what few of the thousands who are tracking Shelbyville's girls realize is that their basketball success is matched in the classroom. All seven seniors associated with the team—players Misty Lamb, Lynda Motes, Mitzi Rice, Angela Mullins and managers Scarlett Bonds Nicole Campbell and Lori Jones—are National Honor Society members. The teams' cumulative grade point average is 3.43 with a 3.59 in the fall semester. Senior players had a 4.0 during the fall.

So outstanding has been the work in the classroom that one wonders if the academic and athletic success are related. Senior guard Lynda Motes says the two go hand in hand. "If you play basketball, you have to pass," said Motes, who ranks near the top of her class with an academic load that includes honors and advanced courses.

"Sometimes you can try playing too smart. You have a work at channeling your thinking ability in the right direction, but that doesn't mean you take time to think about each thing you do when you're playing."

"We know not many players are going to get scholarships. If I get a scholarship, it will be academic, not athletic."

Rice, who has already signed a scholarship with Tennessee Tech, still puts her stock in a degree and good grades.

"No matter how good you are, you're not going to play basketball the rest of your life," Rice said. "The reason we go to school is to get an education. Basketball is just part of our total education."

Mrs. Ardis Rittenberry, the school's National Honor Society sponsor, also works as an academic adviser for the team. A former cheerleader sponsor, Rittenberry oversees the academic progress of each player, arranging for tutoring for those who falter.

"I want to help everyone with the team do the best they can, and our other students feel the same way," Rittenberry said.

"When a player has trouble in a classroom setting, one of the students who is an honor society member will work in a free period, giving them one-on-one help."

Senior Sonya Harris is just such a student. "As a student, I'm proud of the team and what they have meant to our school," Harris said. "When they were featured on ESPN, I got excited. We're proud to have our school recognized. I don't think there is any jealousy. We all are proud of each other."

Teacher Joan Gray, who counts Motes among her honors English pupils, said that in just one year at the school she had seen many admirable qualities in the nature of the players.

"They have a self-confidence and competitiveness that is unique. They have the belief that they can do anything if they put forth enough effort and work hard enough," Gray said, see that same spirit in the classroom that's exhibited on the playing floor.

Undoubtedly, basketball at Shelbyville is special. The Eaglettes are the Sweethearts

of the Hardwood in Bedford Country. There is extraordinary admiration, so much so that Lamb says it's difficult to explain Eaglette basketball to outsiders.

"It's like a family of good country girls who will get after anybody who comes after us, and we have fans that will follow us anywhere," said Lamb the state's Class AAA Miss Basketball and the leading academian among the seniors.

"We love our fans and they love us. I remember that in December when we were in Altoona [Pa.] for the tournament up there, this little boy who is a big, big fan came up to us and told us it was his birthday. He said all he wanted was an Eaglette win. After we won, he was so happy. It was the most heart-warming thing I've ever been through."

Principal Mike Bone says this Shelbyville team is different from the rest.

"I wouldn't say they're more well-rounded, but they have more stability," Bone said. "They're considerably more serious in every area. And that's the way they play, too."

"It doesn't bother them when they are on television or have reporters here. They take everything in stride and don't flaunt their prestige. They're low key, very methodical."

The team's oneness isn't limited to starters. Mullins, a reserve, says the team is together as one.

"Coach [Rick] Insell says we are all one team, that we have no stars and that we are a family," Mullins said.

"That's the way we all look at it. We work together as one, helping each other with our studies, just as we help when we're playing. We love each other like sisters."

□ 1220

APPOINTMENT OF DELEGATION TO ATTEND CONFERENCE OF THE INTERPARLIMENTARY UNION AT BUDAPEST, HUNGARY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 22 United States Code 276a-1 the Chair appoints to the delegation to attend the Conference of the Interparliamentary Union, to be held in Budapest, Hungary, on March 13 through March 18, 1989, the following Members on the part of the House:

Mr. SCHEUER of New York, chairman;

Mr. CONYERS of Michigan, vice chairman;

Mr. FROST of Texas;

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT of Arkansas; and

Mr. BLAZ of Guam.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KYL) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BILIRAKIS, for 60 minutes, on March 21.

Mr. BILIRAKIS, for 60 minutes, on March 22.

Mr. BARTLETT, for 60 minutes, on March 14.

Mr. PETRI, for 60 minutes, on March 14.

Mr. PETRI, for 60 minutes, on March 15.

Mr. PETRI, for 60 minutes, on March 16.

Mr. PETRI, for 60 minutes, on March 17.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MADIGAN, for 10 minutes, today. (The following Members (at the request of Mr. PANETTA) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. TALLON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DE LA GARZA, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. DE LA GARZA, for 60 minutes, on March 14.

Mr. DE LA GARZA, for 60 minutes, on March 15.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PANETTA) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PICKLE.

Mr. ANDERSON in 10 instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in 10 instances.

Mr. BROWN of California in 10 instances.

Mr. ANNUNZIO in six instances.

Mr. CARDIN.

Mr. TRAFICANT.

Mr. KANJORSKI.

Mr. LIPINSKI.

Mr. FRANK.

Mr. EDWARDS of California.

Mr. LANTOS in three instances.

Mr. BEILENSEN.

Mr. MONTGOMERY.

Mr. STARK.

Mr. OBERSTAR.

Mr. THOMAS A. LUKEN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KYL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LENT.

Mr. FRENZEL.

Mr. GREEN.

Mr. PORTER.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT.

Mr. MADIGAN.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 553. An act to provide for more balance in the stocks of dairy products purchased by the Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TALLON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 14, 1989, at 12 noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

744. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the request for appropriations for fiscal year 1990 providing funding for initiatives identified in "Building a Better America", pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1107 (H. Doc. No. 101-36); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

745. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Financial Management), transmitting a report on the value of property, supplies, and commodities provided by the Berlin Magistrate for the quarter October 1, 1988 through December 31, 1988, pursuant to Public Law 99-190, section 8014 (99 Stat. 1205); Public Law 99-591, section 9010 (100 Stat. 3341-102); Public Law 100-202, title VIII, section 8010; to the Committee on Appropriations.

746. A letter from the Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a copy of the selected acquisition reports [SARs] for the quarter ending December 31, 1988, pursuant to U.S.C. 2432; to the Committee on Armed Services.

747. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting the report on allied contributions to the common defense, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 1928 nt.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

748. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for civil defense programs for fiscal years 1990 and 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; to the Committee on Armed Services.

749. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the United States Mint for fiscal years 1990 and 1991, and for other purposes, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

750. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report on the adherence of the United States to obligations undertaken in arms control agreements and on problems related to compliance by other nations with the provisions of bilateral and multilateral arms control agreements to which the United States is a party, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2592; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

751. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report on the adherence of the United States to obligations undertaken in arms control agreements, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2592; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

752. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification of his intention to extend the waiver of the application of the relevant export criterion of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act,

pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2155(a)(2) (H.Doc. No. 101-35); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

753. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the original reports of political contributions by Vernon A. Walters, of Florida, as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary-designate to the Federal Republic of Germany; by Henry E. Catto, of Texas, as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary-designate to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and members of their families, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

754. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the original report of political contributions by Joseph V. Reed, of Connecticut, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as Chief of Protocol for the White House, and members of his family, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

755. A letter from the Deputy Director for Administration, Central Intelligence Agency, transmitting a report of the Agency's activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1988, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 522(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

756. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Policy, Budget and Administration, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report of the Department's activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1988, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

757. A letter from the Director, Peace Corps, transmitting a report of actions taken to increase competition for contracts during fiscal year 1988, pursuant to 41 U.S.C. 419; to the Committee on Government Operations.

758. A letter from the General Counsel, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the annual report of the Office of Administration on its activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1988, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

759. A letter from the Director, Communications and Legislative Affairs, U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting a copy of the Commission's report of its compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during calendar year 1988, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Operations.

760. A letter from the Director, Communications and Legislative Affairs, U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting a report of the Commission's activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1988, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

761. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting proposed regulations governing the solicitation of parent and subsidiary corporations by a trade association or a trade association's separate segregated fund, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 438(d); to the Committee on House Administration.

762. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting notification that the Bureau of Land Management advises that no compensatory royalty agreements for oil and gas were executed and entered into during fiscal year 1988, pursuant to 30 U.S.C. 226(g); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

763. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting notification of a proposed Department of Transportation/Federal Aviation Administration Demonstration Project to be conducted at 11 FAA facilities to help to determine the relative effectiveness of pay incentives, in lieu of special rates, in solving chronic staffing problems in the Federal Government, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 4703(b)(4)(B), (6); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

764. A letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting information copies of a repair and alteration prospectus for renovations to the GAO building, Washington, DC; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

765. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a copy of the strategic plan for the modernization and associated restructuring of the National Weather Service, pursuant to Public Law 100-685, section 407(a); to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ANDERSON: Committee on Public Works and Transportation. H.R. 1231. A bill to direct the President to establish an emergency board to investigate and report respecting the dispute between Eastern Airlines and its collective bargaining units, with an amendment (Report 101-3). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 1371. A bill to establish a series of seven Presidential primaries at which the public may express its preference for the nomination of an individual for election to the office of President of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BEILENSON:

H.R. 1372. A bill to provide for the implementation of the President's pay recommendations under section 225 of the Federal Salary Act of 1967, except with respect to Members of Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LAGOMARSINO:

H.R. 1373. A bill to authorize the Agency for International Development to pay the expenses of an election observer mission for the 1989 presidential elections in Panama; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHEUER (for himself, Mr.

ATKINS, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. ROE, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. LEWIS of

Georgia, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. AUCCOIN, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mrs. COLLINS, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. MOODY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. WEISS, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. WISE, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. FRANK, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CARPER, and Mr. HAYES of Illinois);

H.R. 1374. A bill to amend the Head Start Act to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 1990; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

H.R. 1375. A bill to require cable television operators to regularly disclose their rates and services to the Federal Communications Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr.

MILLER of California, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. COELHO, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mr. CHENEY):

H.R. 1376. A bill to amend titles II, V and VII of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to make the mining of coal without a permit a criminal offense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 1377. A bill to amend chapters 83 and 84 of title 5, United States Code, to eliminate the deposit requirement for certain survivor benefits, and to provide for a study concerning ways to maintain the long-term value of the survivor benefits provided under those chapters; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANTOS (for himself, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. OWENS of Utah):

H.J. Res. 187. Joint resolution to commend the Governments of Israel and Egypt on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the Treaty of Peace between Israel and Egypt; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HANSEN:

H.J. Res. 188. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for 4-year terms of office for Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KYL (for himself, Mr. BAL-LENGER, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. STUMP, and Mr. WALKER):

H.J. Res. 189. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that expenditures for a fiscal year shall neither exceed revenues for such fiscal year nor 19 per centum of the Nation's gross national product for the last calendar year ending before the beginning of such fiscal year; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland:

H.J. Res. 190. Joint resolution to designate April 6, 1989, as "National Student-Athlete Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TALLON:

H.J. Res. 191. Joint resolution expressing the appreciation of the Congress for the

heroism and political achievements of Brig. Gen. Francis Marion and encouraging local communities throughout South Carolina to prepare ceremonies and activities to commemorate his great victories and political achievements during the Revolutionary War; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LENT:

H. Con. Res. 71. Concurrent resolution authorizing the 1989 Special Olympics Torch Relay to be run through the Capitol grounds; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina (for himself and Mr. DAVIS):

H. Res. 107. Resolution authorizing the printing of the committee print entitled "Coastal Waters in Jeopardy; Reversing, the Decline and Protecting America's Coastal Resources" as a House document; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

33. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois, relative to members of the Armed Forces who are unaccounted for in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

34. Also, memorial of the Fourth Kosrae State Legislature, Eastern Caroline Islands, relative to the consideration of the Republic of the Marshall Islands as an ultrahazardous nuclear waste storage site; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Energy and Commerce.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 22: Mr. RUSSO, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. WALSH, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. ROSE, Mr. COBLE, Mr. PURSELL, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 56: Mr. BARNARD, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. PRICE, Mr. RIDGE, Mrs. ROUKEMA, and Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 58: Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia, and Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 60: Mr. MACHTELEY, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. STUMP, Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. RAVENEL, and Mr. SCHUETTE.

H.R. 63: Mr. ROTH, Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. SMITH of Mississippi, Mr. GOSS, Mr. STALLINGS, and Mr. SHAW.

H.R. 81: Mr. GILMAN, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. EVANS, Mr. LELAND, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. UPTON, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. SOLARZ, and Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 91: Mr. FAWELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. PORTER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. FISH, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. CLARKE, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DIXON, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. WEBER, Mr. HENRY, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. AUCCOIN, Mr. FAZIO, and Mr. APPELEGATE.

H.R. 118: Mr. FAZIO, Mr. RHODES, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, and Mr. DYMALLY.

H.R. 159: Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 289: Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 303: Mr. McHUGH, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. McDADE, Mr. RITTER, Mr. BOSCO, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.R. 403: Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. DYMALLY, and Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 449: Mr. BATES, Mr. STENHOLM, and Mr. ARMEY.

H.R. 509: Mr. AUCCOIN, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BLAZ, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CONTE, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DYSON, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. FISH, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. LENT, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. McCRERY, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PORTER, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SMITH of Mississippi, Mr. UPTON, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. WILSON.

H.R. 537: Mr. SLATTERY.

H.R. 563: Mr. SKAGGS, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. ROSE, Mr. LIVINGSTON, and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 567: Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. NAGLE, and Mr. PRICE.

H.R. 594: Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. DIXON, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. TALLON, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. RHODES, Mr. WEISS, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GRAY, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota.

H.R. 664: Mr. HASTERT, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. SMITH of Mississippi, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. STUMP, Mr. McCRERY: Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. COX, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. LELAND, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. PARKER, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. COELHO.

H.R. 696: Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. VENTO, Mr. MACHTELEY, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. CAMPBELL of California.

H.R. 697: Mr. DANNEMEYER.

H.R. 719: Mr. SUNDQUIST.

H.R. 720: Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. JONES of Georgia, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 746: Mr. TORRES and Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 771: Mr. McCRERY, Mr. PENNY, and Mr. BOEHLERT.

H.R. 780: Mr. EVANS, Mr. FISH, and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 899: Mr. SISISKY, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. MADIGAN.

H.R. 913: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ROE, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. DYMALLY, and Mr. FAZIO.

H.R. 930: Mr. YATES, Mr. FOGLIETTA, and Mrs. COLLINS.

H.R. 963: Mr. BATES, Mr. BEREUTER, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. HENRY, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. PENNY, Mr. SMITH of Florida, and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 984: Mr. ATKINS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. WALSH, Mr. PORTER, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. KANJORSKI.

H.R. 995: Mr. HERGER and Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H.R. 1025: Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. BATES, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FOGLIETTA, and Mr. PENNY.

H.R. 1095: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. WOLFE.

H.R. 1101: Mr. FALEOMAVEGA and Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 1104: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. WALKER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. RIDGE, and Mr. HANCOCK.

H.R. 1108: Mr. HUGHES and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 1110: Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mr. BAKER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. OXLEY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HERGER, Mr. WALSH, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. PETRI, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. GORDON, Mr. JONTZ, and Mrs. LLOYD.

H.R. 1111: Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MINETA, and Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H.R. 1112: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota,
Mr. AKAKA, and Mr. MRAZEK.

H.R. 1185: Mr. TORRES, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FAZIO, and Mr. GILMAN.

H.R. 1231: Mr. CLAY, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. PALONE, Mr. SABO, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. WEISS, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. TALLON, Mr. MOODY, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. COYNE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. GRAY, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. MINETA, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. SAWYER.

Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 1237: Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. COLLINS, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 1295: Mr. CRANE, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. SMITH of Mississippi, and Mr. LENT.

H.R. 1297: Mrs. MORELLA.

H.J. Res. 103: Mr. HERGER.

H.J. Res. 104: Mr. ANNUNZIO.

H.J. Res. 110: Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. RITTER, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. WYLIE, and Mr. WELDON.

H. J. Res. 112: Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DYSON, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. KASICH, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LaFALCE, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. THOMAS A. LUKEN, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MOAKLEY, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SYNAR, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. BART-

LETT, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. FROST, Mr. GREEN,
Mr. HUTTO, Mr. HYDE, Mr. JENKINS, Mr.
KOLTER, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mrs. MARTIN of Il-
linois, and Mr. STENHOLM.

H.J. Res. 130: Mr. GILMAN, Mr. McCOLLUM, Mr. VOLKMER, and Mr. BUSTAMANTE.

H.J. Res. 145: Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. APPEGATE, Mr. CHENEY, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. CARR, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. FROST, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. FASCELL, and Mr. COX.

H.J. Res. 169: Mr. FROST.

H. Con. Res. 3: Mr. COELHO, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. INHOFE, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. BRUCE, and Ms. SNOWE.
H. Con. Res. 40: Mr. HORTON.

H. Con. Res. 45: Mrs. Vuc

BARTON of Texas, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. PACKARD, and Mr. PORTER.

H. Con. Res. 46: Mr. McGRATH.

H. Con. Res. 60: Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. MILLER of Washington.

H. Res. 56: Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. SHAW, Mr. UPTON, Mr. FAWELL, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, and Mr. KOLBE.

H. Res. 102: Mr. MATSUI, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. ATKINS, and Mrs. MORELLA.